



LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS





Price 2d by post 2½d.

The Anglo-Catholic Position.

IN RE

THE ARCHBISHOPS' DECISION ON LIGHTS AND INCENSE.

*Five Reunion Notes contributed to 'CHURCH BELLS' during
August and September, 1899.*

BY

HORATIO EARL NELSON.

CHURCH NEWSPAPER CO., LTD.,
3 & 5 CECIL COURT, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, W.C.

DEVOTIONAL BOOKS.

Paper Cover, 6d.; cloth, red edges, 1s.

The Churchman's Sixpenny Devotional Library.

Edited by the Rev. A. E. HUMPHREYS, M.A.

Rector of Fakenham, Norfolk; late Fellow & Assistant Tutor of Trinity College, Cambridge.

No. 1. BY THE EDITOR.

CHRIST'S DAILY ORDERS

From each day's New Testament Evening Lesson.

'We set a very high value on Mr. Humphrey's plan, and are disposed to think that many who began to use his book during Lent would maintain the habit throughout the Christian year.'—*Guardian*.

'The thoughts are often very beautiful and original, and we cordially recommend this little book for parochial distribution, and especially for Bible-classes, mothers' meetings, &c. It will also be of great value to those who are able to devote time to meditation, and who are in the habit of giving devotional addresses. The introduction to the work is a valuable article of "How to Study the Meaning of the New Testament as a Whole."'—*Goodwill*.

'We can honestly recommend the little book. It will be a real help to its possessor.'—*Church Army Gazette*.

'Those who use it cannot fail to profit by its careful arrangements.'

Rochester Diocesan Magazine.

'It is the most complete manual of study for busy people that we have seen.'—*Church S. S. Magazine*.

SIMPLE THOUGHTS FOR THE CHURCH'S SEASONS.

By A. B. TUCKER.

Cloth, bevelled boards, red edges, price 2s. ; by post, 2s. 3d.

Part I.—Advent. Part II.—Christmas and the Epiphany. Part III.—Lent.
Part IV.—Easter. Part V.—Ascensiontide, Whitsuntide, and Trinity Sunday.
Part VI.—The Saints' Days.

THE GUARDIAN says:—'Short passages of Holy Scripture with suitable reflections upon them, collects, verses from well-known writers of religious poetry, and proper Psalms are carefully arranged, and the result is a good book in thorough harmony with the Teaching of the Church of England.'

WESTERN MORNING NEWS says:—'Helpful to those who wish to have their devotions guided. The thoughts for each occasion are briefly put and very suitable to the season.'

CHURCH FAMILY NEWSPAPER says:—'The book is meant to be a help "to the timid and self-distrustful pilgrim." There is a text, followed by a short meditation, for each day in Advent. The same line is followed with Christmas and the Epiphany, Lent and Easter, Ascensiontide, Whitsuntide, and Trinity Sunday. The last series is on the Saints' Days. The Meditations are simple and devout. It is just the book to put into the hands of those whose time for meditation is limited and who need some direction for their thoughts.'

THE CHURCH NEWSPAPER CO., Ltd., 3 & 5 Cecil Court, St. Martin's Lane, W.C.

The Anglo-Catholic Position.

I.

THE Ultramontane and the Puritan, ever since the Reformation settlement, have been, and still are, the declared enemies of all Anglo-Catholic teaching. It is well for us to be ever on our guard against either of these extremes, as each, from their different standpoints, would do everything to create a disruption in the Anglican Communion. Their influence in the Press is insidious and far-reaching, for in many papers, not called by their names, they have gained an influence on the staff not dreamt of by the many.

These will write against the decision as having no real power or binding influence upon any except those who have specially been parties to the appeal. Others will seek to magnify its anti-ritual teaching, hoping thereby to get rid of the Ritualists altogether. I sincerely trust that the true Anglo-Catholic will see through these miserable tactics, and take a more sensible view of the matter.

It is very easy to pick holes in the decision. It may be argued, if banners in processions are illegal and yet allowed, why not candles and incense? But we all allow that it is an unbiassed decision, given by the Archbishops in their spiritual capacity, and in accordance with the direction of the Prayer-book for explaining any doubts that may arise in the construction of our rubrics.

Again, there are many things to be thankful for in the arguments on either side, and in the decision itself. The Lambeth judgment on the Lincoln trial is accepted, as far as it goes, as a ruling judgment.

It is curious to note that in the first article of the *Daily News* on the decision they allowed this. What they took exception to

was the fact that the Archbishops did not state the fact that the Lambeth judgment only received legal power because it had been accepted without alteration by the final Court of Appeal.

It is enough for us that the temporal Court did not attempt to alter the judgment of the spiritual Court below, and we all accept it as an interpretation of the spirituality. And, if we look narrowly into the Archbishops' decision, we shall find that it has been given in the same free and independent spirit, without any appeal to the diverse decisions of the Court of Final Appeal.

There is an attempt made in some of the papers to which I have referred to taint the decision with the accusation that, like the Privy Council decisions of old time, it was a trimming to the prominent opinions of the day, against which we have the acknowledgment by most that the decision has pleased neither party, not going far enough for one, and going too far to suit the other. But I would ask anybody who has carefully read the able arguments advanced on either side if it would have been possible, if they were to lay down what the Prayer-book clearly permitted, to have come to any other conclusion?

I would also draw attention to the way in which the decision has been very carefully guarded. I give two extracts in reference to the ceremonial use of incense :—

‘Yet it is right to observe that even now the Liturgical use of incense is not by law permanently excluded from the Church's Ritual. The section in Elizabeth's Act which allows the Crown, with the consent of the Archbishop of Canterbury, to order new ceremonies, does not forbid the inclusion of the use of incense in such new ceremonies, if such are ordered. It would always be possible, if some great occasion made it suitable, for the Sovereign, with the advice of the Primate, to order a great ceremonial in which the use of incense should form a part. The question of probability need not now be raised. Many things might become probable, when our toleration of one another has risen to a higher level, which are not probable at present. But, meanwhile, the law requires that the clergy should wait for the action of lawful authority before bringing any additional ceremonial to form a part of public worship.

‘In conclusion, we are far from saying that incense in itself is an unsuitable or undesirable accompaniment to Divine worship. The injunction for its use by Divine authority in the Jewish Church would alone forbid such a conclusion. But this is not the question before us.’

It is here especially laid down that there is no legal enactment against its ceremonial use, although it is ruled that there is no permission for its use in our present rubrics.

It is also emphatically laid down that, after the use of incense

by Divine appointment in the ritual of the Jewish Church, it is impossible to look upon it as a practice contrary to God's law. Nay, further, it is distinctly affirmed that, *under proper authority*, the ceremonial use of incense might be specially allowed in our Church.

I have always pressed upon my ritualistic friends that if we could only start from a firm legal standpoint, so as not to appear to be intentional breakers of a known law, I would go earnestly with them in a demand for great liberty, and for the *permissive* use of many things, *Catholic and Scriptural*, which our differing congregations may desire; and what a grand standpoint for such an appeal for further liberty is given to us by this portion of the archiepiscopal decision!

I see some people have at once acted on the decision without waiting for any action on the part of their own diocesan. However much we may approve of such willing obedience, we doubt the wisdom of it. The decision must be made known to the Bishops, and it must be left to each individual Bishop in the responsible office of governing his diocese to decide as to the *time and the manner* in which the decision is to be carried out. I would strongly urge all true Catholics, in every case where their own diocesan enforces it upon them, to obey the decision as regards the ceremonial use of lights and incense. But the decision is a simple decision on the interpretation of the rubrics, without a thought of the feelings of the laity of the different congregations where incense has become a regular use for many years.

There is no doubt that, where the ceremonial use of incense has been only recently introduced, there would be little hardship in its immediate discontinuance. But there are other cases where, from the previous uncertainty of the law in this matter, the whole of the congregation, with its unanimous consent, have, for twelve years or more, received benefits, according to their view, from this additional ceremonial. It has brought nearer the customs of *the Universal Church*. The immediate or peremptory discontinuance of the use would, in such a case, bring a great strain upon the consciences of those laymen attending such churches on the top of previous restrictions which they have loyally but painfully obeyed.

In the face of the statement that the ceremonial use of incense is neither illegal nor unscriptural, our earnest sympathies would go forth towards all those bishops who, in the interests of those committed to their charge, were *very careful* in the enforcement

of this decision, and our earnest prayers for all congregations should be offered for steadfastness to the Anglo-Catholic Communion under the severe trial of having to give up, if only for a time, any of those Catholic practices which they have learnt to love.

II.

In my first remarks on the Archbishops' decision I pointed out that we should be playing into the hands of our two greatest enemies if we acted as a divided Church in this present matter. I am more than ever impressed by the truth of this. The *Catholic Times* is doing its best to cause a split, and is pointing out the direct Erastianism of the decision, and our committal to a State-governed Church if in any way we accept the Archbishops' ruling, and the Puritans are polishing their weapons, and are evidently hoping that this decision is only the first step, and that from that standing ground they may easily root up all the work of the last sixty years.

It is very unwise in us to play into the hands of our avowed enemies by reading the present crisis in the pessimist way in which they would tempt us to look upon it. All who calmly look to the history of the National Church for the last hundred years ought to know something more of what a State-governed Church really is, and to realise more the wonderful deliverance which these last hundred years have wrought for our branch of Christ's Church in these latter days. Some sixty years ago the deadening influence of the Walpole *régime* was still upon us, but we look back with thankfulness to the Wesleyan revival and to the great work of Wilberforce, which stirred the nation to the great sacrifices for the destruction of slavery. We rejoice in the zeal in foreign missions of the Church Missionary Society, and generally in the great Evangelical movement under Simeon and others, which gave fresh evidence of the workings of the Holy Spirit against the enervating influences by which Erastianism sought to bind us down.

Then some of us still living can rejoice in the wonderful regeneration wrought by the great Tractarian movement, and the great spiritual life that has been going on and is still continued in its fullest vigour. We who have been spared to witness such a revival may laugh at the bare possibility of our becoming again a State-ridden Church, simply because the ceremonial use of lights

and incense has been for a time restricted by the Archbishop's interpretation of the present law.

There is no doubt that the Uniformity Act of 1559 was as great a bit of Erastianism as was ever enacted, but it saved the Catholicity of the National Church. Elizabeth would have willingly restored the first Prayer-book of Edward, but the persecutions of Mary's reign had created such a spirit against the old religion that nothing but the Queen's determination could have saved our Church from the enervating influence of the Continental reformers. This admission may, in the eyes of our opponents, dub us as a State Church, but this is not the first time in the history of the Catholic Church that the action of the temporal power has been over-ruled by God for the preservation of His Church.

I must, however, point out that the Archbishop has been unjustly accused of attempting to govern us *by State Enactments*. A careful study of his decision will convince any unbiassed mind to the contrary. He has been most anxious to show that, according to his reading, the Convocations, by accepting the Prayer-book of 1662, accepted the act of 1559, and condoned its Erastian character; at all events, it is only on the supposition that it has been accepted by the spirituality that he seeks to bind it upon us. In the rest of the document there is no appeal to the decision of purely State courts. He enforces all the decisions of the Lambeth judgment in the Lincoln case, and appeals directly to its decisions.

There is therefore nothing to prevent us from rallying round our Prayer-book as the guardian of the Catholicity of the National Church. It has been our watchword from the beginning, and may be our watchword still; and though, in the present misunderstanding, some leading Evangelicals have been led astray, and believe, or partially believe, in the alleged Romanising conspiracy, the soundest of them still are ready to stand by the Prayer-book. Many of these men sympathise with the trial of those who find their supposed liberty restricted, and, being themselves full of religious life, realise the impossibility of eventually binding the freedom of a living organization, which is now making great inroads on heathendom both at home and in foreign parts, to the influences of an antiquated Act of Uniformity.

All this will come about in due time. A Church cannot be accused of Erastianism, which is in all its sections working heart and soul for greater spiritual freedom. Those who are impatient of present restrictions must have utterly forgotten the great advances that have been made before we dreamt of considering

the ceremonial use of lights and incense as a necessary part of our forms of worship.

Without them, by God's mercy, the neglected altars, the four-times-a-year celebrations, the lowest views of the Eucharist sacrifice have given place to the highest reverence to all that pertains to that central service of our religion—everywhere to weekly, and in many places to daily, celebrations. Is not this a thing to be thankful for? And are we to despair of a Church which, under the Prayer-book, has made such advances in catholic truth and Bible teaching, simply because, for a time, a restriction has been raised to the use of some ceremonials which give additional sanctity and reverence to the service of God?

A living branch of Christ's Church is bound to be catholic, and to be able to satisfy in its services the requirements of all characters and of all nationalities.

The narrowness of the sect is unknown to catholicity, but the *permissive* use of all that is truly catholic and Scriptural is simply our right, and must be energetically striven for. But we must have some sure standpoints: *Obedience* to existing laws till they are amended; *the example of a united Church* rallying round her Anglo-Catholic position; *a zeal for God's truth and the extension of His kingdom.*

III.

THE *Catholic Times* is as earnest as ever in its condemnation of any clergy who obey their Bishops, on the plea that they are turning back from their principles and bowing down to Erastianism.

I have done my best, in my last week's 'Notes,' to answer their absurd proposition. If we accept the Archbishop's theory (on which alone he has asked our obedience) that the Convocation of 1662 accepted, with our present Prayer-book, Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity of 1559, I have shown that we need not be afraid of this bit of Erastianism, or of acknowledging the good that came of it. It is not the first time the action of the temporal power has been over-ruled for the preservation of the Church, and the State influence brought to bear on the Prayer-book in its structure from time to time is mild compared with the State influence in times past on the Liturgy of the Church by Charles the Great, and Louis the Pious, and others.

I earnestly hope our High Ritualists will not do so foolish a

CARLTON CLUB,

PALL MALL, S.W.

Nov. 22/99

Dear Talbot
I found my small pamphlet
+ a proof of the paper on
the Maria Code in my bag.
So I venture to send them
to you I thought in-
deed sent off very rich

Yours very truly
John Lubbock

se and return Proof without delay to
NGEWAYS & SONS,
General Printers, and Photo-Etchers,
Tower Street, Cambridge Circus, W.C.

Thorne Ro

THE MA

ONE of the safest roads to
cause, and to work for the
doing good to the nation, but
call themselves Christians sho

The surest way to this end
marriage code ; and if, for
allowed, the religious bodies o
support the true Christian vie
their special blessings only in
this Christian view.

In this matter, as in every
hinder the work and to int
should be eager to work toge
therefore, found to be divisio
Divine law in reference to mar
affinity, and that, under the
—that 'they two are no more t
the relationship of consanguinity
with authority. And if, unhap
teaching, we must call upon t
the word as representing all t
witness to the nation of what s
of Christ.

Home Reunion Notes.

THE MARRIAGE CODE.

ONE of the safest roads to unity is common work in a common cause, and to work for the purity of domestic life is not only doing good to the nation, but is a work that all who profess and call themselves Christians should willingly take in hand.

The surest way to this end is to support a sound and consistent marriage code; and if, for State reasons, some relaxations are allowed, the religious bodies of this country should be careful to support the true Christian view of Holy Matrimony, and to give their special blessings only in such cases which clearly recognise this Christian view.

In this matter, as in every other, the Evil One is ever ready to hinder the work and to introduce division among those who should be eager to work together for such a cause. There are, therefore, found to be divisions as to the interpretation of the Divine law in reference to marriage within the different degrees of affinity; and there are also divisions as to the interpretation of our Lord's words in reference to divorce. But, over and above these two questions of interpretation, there are two notable facts in reference to marriage: First, that Christian marriage is placed in Holy Scripture on the highest possible plane as symbolising the union between Christ and His Church, and by our Lord's enforcement of what may be considered a law of nature, 'They two shall be one flesh.' Second, Napoleon and all great legislators have acknowledged the importance for the well being of a nation that they should have a clear and consistent and easily understood marriage code.

Anything that tends to weaken the first fact must lead to a general looseness of life, while anything that damages the consistency of a marriage code, by relaxing some of its provisions, will inevitably lead by degrees to the relaxation of them all.

The upper classes having indulged in the luxury of divorce by suits in the House of Lords, found it impossible to deny the same opportunities to all; but the consequences have been detrimental to conjugal morality, as the reports from the Divorce Courts too clearly show. And when we go to America, where in some of the States the law of divorce is much laxer than with us, the marriage tie has become a farce, and the sanctity of married life a delusion.

Surely all Christians should combine in checking this growing evil as much as possible. One way is to watch against collusion, which, I fear, with every care on the part of our judges, frequently occurs. Another way is that all religious bodies in the country should agree to maintain the sanctity of marriage and the paramount importance of pledges publicly given before God and the congregation. Unhappily, those who are prominent to prevent the Church's sanction of the marriage of divorced people are generally denounced by the secular papers and by the leading dissenting journals; and yet, if the evils revealed in the Divorce Courts are in any way to be stayed, such a righteous protest on behalf of our common Christianity is a necessity. Surely, whether it affects what is called the innocent party or not, those who for any cause have renounced the Church's blessing and broken their most solemn vows have no right to demand the Church's blessing a second time, and to seek to renew their vows to another, going through the same service in which once before they were pronounced man and wife with the solemn words that they whom God has joined together let no man put asunder. If the State law permits the re-marriage, let them have a civil marriage; but if there is any truth in the higher teaching of Holy Scripture and in the solemn words of the marriage service, and if the teaching of the Church and the Bible is not to be a delusion and a scare, no such solemn recognition of their union should be given by the Church.

Again, as to the marriage with a deceased wife's sister, the evil is the breaking through the uniformity and consistency of the present code, which, based on the higher view of Holy Matrimony—that 'they two are no more twain, but one flesh'—recognises the relationship of consanguinity and affinity as one and the same. This is the Church's law; and the Church's blessing, in the name of common Christianity, should be refused to such unions. If the State decides on making such unions lawful, there can be a civil marriage, but even here there is a great danger to the State at large unless a fresh code of marriage, on clearly defined limits, is authoritatively put forth. In those countries where such a breaking of the laws of affinity occurs, they do not stop at the deceased wife's sister. There is the deceased brother's wife, the niece, and so on, for there is no limit if you break one link of the chain.

Here, again, a desire to propitiate the great and the powerful was the moving cause. Lord Lyndhurst's Act sanctioned all such marriages, and legitimatised their issue up to the date of the new Act, which then made all such marriages in future illegal, and the progeny illegitimate. The old law allowed the legitimacy of the children if no one during the lifetime of either parent had objected to the marriage.

Then came the looseness of colonial life, which was originally defended by the difficulty of getting a wife in the then small populated colonies. Hence the demand was made more pressing for an alteration of the law. But a country with divorce laws allowing the re-marriage of the parties, and a country with a damaged marriage code, must come year by year to greater laxity, till the idea of the purity of marriage and the common bonds of publicly given pledges is abolished from among us. Under such laxity no one will come to think seriously of marriage; each one will go according to their passing lusts. In time no laws of consanguinity or affinity will be allowed to bar the gratification of such desires, and the bare fact that divorce is easy will prevent the necessity of a careful choice, as of a life companion, and the whole morality of the nation will be destroyed.

I call, then, upon all Christians, before it is too late, to save us from such evils; to vindicate in every possible way the sanctity of the marriage tie. And if, unhappily, from political causes, the present marriage code is to be broken, that all unite together in demanding a *clear and definite marriage code* put forth with authority. And if, unhappily, this code falls short of God's teaching, we must call upon the Church, in the fullest sense of the word as representing all the baptized, to give her warning witness to the nation of what she believes to be the true teaching of Christ.

NELSON.

thing as to play into the hands of our opponents. This persistent endeavour of the *Catholic Times* should be a warning. The Bishop of Lincoln's and the Bishop of Rochester's letters, and Sir Theodore Hope's wise advice should lead them to pause before so committing themselves.

On the three great occasions of danger to our Anglo-Catholic position there is much to be gathered from history, and we should be indeed unworthy of the past if we were unmindful of the great dangers we were in, and of our merciful preservation from them. The past history of a Church or of a people brings home to us a lesson which it would be wise for us to take to heart.

During Edward's and Elizabeth's reigns, Anglo-Catholic principles were in great danger of complete shipwreck.

It is true that in the twelfth century great advances were made for good. Our wonderful cathedrals were built, bearing a noble witness to the truth ; there was much missionary zeal at the first rise of the Mendicant Orders, and there were many great saints up to the very time of the Reformation movement ; but no one can read *Erasmus and his Times* without realising the magnitude of the evils and corruptions that had accumulated, calling for an early and effective reform. All the great saints of the day were pressing for it, but the corruptions were so many and so great that the rulers shrank from dealing with them till too late, so that, when the reforming Council of Trent was at last summoned, a large portion of Western Christendom had already broken away. It could in no sense claim to be an Œcumenical Council ; it did not really properly represent the religious life of Western Christendom. And to prevent any chance of reunion, persecution, instead of persuasion and mutual conference, became the order of the day. Is it to be wondered at that, with many reformers, the two great Catholic principles of an Apostolic ministry and the true meaning of the two great Sacraments were in too many cases lost sight of altogether ?

In England, happily, Episcopacy was preserved, and the great Protestant leaders on the Continent specially congratulated us on the fact. But we also had the great privilege of preserving the belief in the Real Presence and the Memorial Sacrifice. This was clearly shown in the first Prayer-book of Edward, which most of the old religion were ready to accept as maintaining the old traditions.

The persecuted refugees from the Continent, and subsequently our own persecutions under Mary, made it impossible to check Puritan innovations. But the action of Elizabeth already referred

to preserved these principles in the amended Prayer-book, and under that the great prelates of the reign of James I. and Charles I. were enabled to maintain our Catholic heritage.

Then came the Great Rebellion and the triumph of Puritanism, the suppression of the Prayer-book and the substitution of an *un*-episcopally ordained ministry in the place of our more orthodox divines. But God had not forsaken us, and, under Sancroft and Cosin and others, our present Prayer-book was drawn up, and the same Catholic heritage was preserved, Cosin taking care that in the Consecration Prayer '*a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction*' should find a place. Under this we find fresh life in the Church—the noble stand of the seven Bishops against James II., the testimony of the non-juring divines under William and Mary, the growth of the Church during the reign of Anne.

Then came our last great trouble under Walpole, who, for the safety of the Protestant succession, was determined to Erastianise the Church. How well he succeeded we of the present generation too well know.

The great Evangelical revival did much to resist this tyranny, and in many ways to vindicate the spiritual freedom of the Church. But the state of our churches, our fonts, and communion-tables showed only too surely that the old Catholic standpoints had not yet been fully realised. But we had the Prayer-book, though very little used, and it has often been remarked to me that there were more true and essentially Catholic principles to be found among our Prayer-book Christians in the country villages, than can be found among our present congregations, notwithstanding the many additional privileges which have been vouchsafed to them.

But in the great Catholic revival the same objects were always kept in view. Of course, in improved services, by the translation of ancient hymns, by sermons and numerous publications, we did much; but in those days we had to fight over surplices, so there was not much ritual, but the motto of the Cambridge Camden Society was '*Donec templa reficeris*,' and we steadily set to work, and every cleansed font, and every restored altar with a plain, but no longer moth-eaten, cloth upon it, and every restored chancel, and every restored or rebuilt church, taught its silent lesson, and began to show our English people what Christian worship really ought to be. With this, as in the other restorations, new life and vigour was witnessed to on every side, and the true Catholic principles of our Prayer-book were again publicly

accepted, and the enervating power of Erastianism for ever laid low.

We are free to demand all things truly Catholic and Scriptural, and in God's good time they will be fully granted and maintained ; but we must hold fast to an Apostolic ministry, and to the full and pure teaching of the Sacramental system, as the surest way, now as ever, to real life and to real unity.

IV.

My extracts from the Puritan papers are as full as ever of rejoicings over the coming overthrow of the Catholic Movement and the expulsion of the Ritualists. To those of our own communion who have joined this movement, Professor Sanday's paper * must have come 'as a bolt from the blue,' and though many of his personal friends are among those who have signed certain resolutions, he does not hesitate to state clearly and concisely his views.

He clearly points out certain things which have given cause for the antagonistic view which these men have taken. 'We can see how one step led on to another ; we can see how the feeling of uneasiness gradually becomes suspicion, and how suspicion excites alarm, and how alarm expresses itself in the demand for repression.'

Nevertheless, he does not hesitate to say that, 'at the present moment, the English nation is in danger of committing a serious injustice' towards the High Ritualists and their avowed intentions, and this injustice lies in our confounding the terms Roman and Catholic.

'Speaking broadly, I believe that the High Church party *does* aim at making the Church of England Catholic, and *does not* aim at making it Roman. An instructed High Churchman would not allow that he was trying to make the Church of England more Catholic, but only that he was trying to assert those elements of Catholicity which were inherent, though perhaps latent, in its constitution.

'Our Church is Catholic in the same sense in which the Church of Rome and the Churches of the East are Catholic. It

* *The Catholic Movement and the Archbishops' Decision.* With a Note on Certain Resolutions. By W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church. (Longmans, Green & Co. 1899.)

holds to the same great standards of faith, and has preserved the same Church order. The Church of England has done this from the first, and gloried in doing it. And if the High Churchman thinks it right to emphasise what he has in common with these other great Churches, I do not see where he can be gainsaid.'

These are noble words of truth and soberness, and coming from such a man should be indeed a great step towards greater unity and brotherly love amongst us. 'Hence,' he goes on to say, 'arises the necessity for authoritative definition, and if we look at it in its broader context, it was such a definition that the Archbishops have been recently asked to give and have given. They themselves, however, have not considered the question submitted to them quite in this light' (*i.e.*, of defining what is distinctly Catholic and what is distinctly Roman). 'They have confined themselves to the smaller issue of what was and what was not in accordance with the law of the Church of England.'

He then proceeds to go carefully into the different reasons given for this decision, and I think all who carefully read the pamphlet will see that he pretty clearly proves that the Archbishops have made many and considerable mistakes in the view they have taken as to law and facts in the explanation with which their decision was accompanied.

But though there are many points in which the reasons for the decision may clearly be shown to be wrong, it is at once our truest policy and our truest duty clearly to obey the decision given in all honesty as the Archbishops' view of the present state of the law.

One of the wisest portions of the pamphlet under review is his summary on the decision: 'The decision is all the more disappointing because the action of the Archbishops which led up to it had seemed so thoroughly statesmanlike and well considered. It was an excellent step to take advantage of the method prescribed at the end of the preface (dating from 1549), concerning the service of the Church. No more quiet and peaceable way could be found, or one the legitimacy of which could be so little questioned. Nor have I really any doubt that, whether it is right or wrong in the nature of things, the decision ought to be obeyed.'

After the state of lawlessness that has been allowed to exist there can be no doubt that, however bitter the self-denial, the duty of obedience to the spiritual authority of the Archbishops and diocesan Bishops is a paramount duty.

It is also the proper policy, it is the only way in which we can show our consistency as members of an Episcopal Church, and the greater the temptation to resist, the greater the proof of our self-sacrificing obedience.

On this standpoint we are in a position to strive in every way to show the weakness of the reasons on which the decision was given, and to move for that greater freedom in the true Catholic and Scriptural usages of which many of us think we have been wrongly deprived.

There are many statements in the decision itself, as I have before pointed out, which help us more than half-way towards re-establishing our rightful heritage; and such words of true sympathy with our position, and such close arguments in support of our claims as this pamphlet contains, should give us renewed hopes for the future peace of the Church.

Many of us knew before, from other letters and communications of Dr. Sanday's, that he had learnt the lessons which he so nobly enforces at the end of his remarks on—'Certain Resolutions: ' 'I confess that these resolutions remind me forcibly of what I would conclude by urging, the solemn duty which we owe alike to God and man, a duty at no time more imperative than at the present, to use the utmost care in ascribing to others such opinions only as are really theirs.'

I thank Dr. Sanday for his pamphlet, and may the blessing pronounced on the peacemakers be fully granted him.

V.

THINGS are certainly looking brighter. The *Catholic Times*, from later extracts received this week, seems to think it has gone too far in its energetic remonstrance at the attitude of the *Church Times* tending to obedience.

The noble pamphlet by Dr. Sanday, to which I alluded last week, is evidently greatly exercising the minds of others, and there is much hope that, though here and there some may consider it right to ignore the advice and wishes of their Diocesan, the unity of our Church will be preserved.

In my rough way I have endeavoured to point out how, in times past—times, too, of much greater difficulty and danger—our branch of Christ's Church has been mercifully preserved.

Some have pointed out that, in these latter days, many of the advances made in restoring to us the whole of our Catholic heritage have been gained in direct disobedience to our bishops, and to argue that if we change our tactics and obey them, all the work of the past will be undone.

It is true that in times past the priests and the people were sooner instructed in the teaching of the great revival of Church life than our rulers.

Archbishop Howley might have done much if he had survived. Henry of Exeter and Dr. Bagot of Oxford were the only ones who seemed to understand the movement, or to give it any kind of sympathy. Most of our rulers were afraid of the consequences, and though in those early times there was no direct disobedience to those set over us, there was no sympathy from them.

The movement came from the priests and the people. When the first outpouring of spiritual zeal was given, it demanded the full life that had hitherto been choked and smothered. We must not quarrel with the ways of God's dealing with us ; to our weak minds it would have been good if our rulers had taken the lead more. Sisterhoods were obliged to work their way unsupported by authority. Warmer services were demanded by our congregations, and though there was no direct opposition to authority, authority was dumb, and is therefore answerable, more or less, for the independent action which it feared to lead.

But there was no direct opposition to authority till the unhappy Public Worship Regulation Act—which, nevertheless, did more to increase our freedom than any other line of action could have done, and even Archbishop Tait became at last a convert to the spiritual reality of the movement when, as Bishop of London, he had learnt the great spiritual power as shown in the advancement of our Church among the masses of the people which the great Ritualists in their earnest and self-denying lives were enabled to put forth. But because in times past we were obliged to act without authority, it is no reason why we should always do so.

Our bishops now have all more or less realised the power of the movement as a great spiritual outcome for the advance of Christianity among our people. Archbishop Benson nobly carried out the amended views of his great predecessor, and after the Lambeth judgment in the trial of the Bishop of Lincoln a distinctly new phase had begun : our bishops had accepted their rightful position as leaders, and we, as members of an Episcopal Church, are bound to obey their admonitions.

I am the last to teach that their decisions are infallible. I believe Dr. Sanday and others have clearly shown that they have made many mistakes in their reading of the law and the history of the past ; but they have done their best, and, if for nothing more than to escape from a state of reckless lawlessness, wherever our Diocesan presses us to accept this decision we are bound to obey. But the desire for freedom cannot be suppressed, and from the sure standpoint of an obedient people under rulers willing to rule we can, I am sure, if we keep united, speedily regain all that may fairly be demanded as truly Catholic.

If we are obedient we shall not be misunderstood, and the outcome of the past crisis will have opened many eyes to the reality of our position ; the idea of conspiracy and treason towards our reformed branch of Christ's Church will be exploded as completely as the lies of Titus Oates in olden times, and the true conception in the minds of our first English reformers, as embodied in the first Prayer-book of Edward, will be fully realised.

CHURCH BELLS

And Illustrated Church News.

The Leading Illustrated Church Paper.

Neither a CLASS PAPER,
Nor a PARTY PAPER,
But a distinctly
CHURCH OF ENGLAND PAPER.

Published every Friday.
Price One Penny.

SUBSCRIPTION: 6s. 6d. per Ann.;
if sent Abroad, 8s. 8d. per Ann.

Twelve Reasons why you should read 'Church Bells':

Because 'CHURCH BELLS is as full of information as it can well be.'—*Morning Post*.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS is catering vigorously and successfully for a very large public.'—*Globe*.

Because 'The literary contents are of a varied nature, dealing with Church affairs in all parts of the world.'

Liverpool Courier.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS is full of useful and interesting information.'—*Western Mercury*.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS admirably sustains the high character it has gained in the literary world.'

Devon and Exeter Gazette.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS has a reputation of its own as one of the best papers of its class.'

Nottingham Daily Guardian.

Because 'The cheerful and chatty "CHURCH BELLS" offers attractive reading of a popular kind.'

Manchester Guardian.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS is one of our very best weeklies.'

Expository Times.

Because 'CHURCH BELLS is one of the best-conducted religious periodicals that we have.'—*Publishers' Circular*.

Because 'There is a bright tone about this journal which readers like.'—*Newsagent*.

Because *The Gentlewoman* speaks of it as 'Our enterprising contemporary.'

Because *The St. James's Budget* calls it 'That bright weekly.'

Order of your Newsagent or Bookstall, or from the Publishing Office—

3 & 5 CECIL COURT, ST. MARTIN'S LANE, LONDON, W.C.







